

Mr. MALCOLM: Would the minister indicate in Hansard where the financial critic said he wanted the stabilization fund to apply to goods sent to the United States?

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, gladly.

Mr. MALCOLM: He said if it was sound why not apply it.

Mr. STEVENS: It does not sound very well, I will admit. The hon. gentleman said:

Now, no one can tell how it is going to work out until he sees the result next year.

That is what we call, in slang, a wise crack. He is pretty safe there.

Mr. MALCOLM: That is logical.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend says that is logical. If a government should confine itself to the imposition of taxes and similar matters in connection with which the full result could be seen a year before the imposition was made, I do not think we would impose very many taxes in this house. Then the hon. gentleman went on:

I said the same thing about the wheat bonus and I repeat it now in regard to this matter. In principle I am opposed to this sort of legislation, because I do not believe it is sound, but if bonuses are going—

Mr. HANBURY: If.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend is not improving his standing here by interjecting that sort of thing.

—if bonuses are going they ought to extend to every natural product and, as someone suggests, factory products as well. I cannot see how you can pick out some part of the community shipping to Great Britain and say to that class that they will have a certain amount made up on what they lose in shipping to Great Britain, while other exporters are given no such consideration. Take for instance the fresh fish producers. According to this they will get a bonus, but the preserved fish man does not.

Then the hon. gentleman went on to a discussion of other items such as canned and salt fish and lumber. A little later he said:

One could name numbers of natural products that fall into the same category. After all, Mr. Speaker, I ask you: Is there any guarantee, except what the Prime Minister said last evening to the effect that the government were considering the matter of machinery, that the man who actually produces the goods will get the benefit of this bonus? The exporter is the one who will get it, according to the budget speech.

And so on.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. STEVENS: What is the matter? I do not want to read the whole of the hon. gentleman's speech, but hon. members might listen to this:

I say to my hon. friend that he will not get very far in assisting the fishermen of the east in shipping fresh fish to England. I believe there was about \$300,000 worth of fresh fish shipped last year to England whereas the shipments to the United States amounted to something like \$6,000,000. If this provision is intended to assist the producer of fish, why does he not get the bonus for the fish he ships to the United States as well as to Great Britain?

So the hon. gentleman proposes to apply this exchange stabilization scheme to goods shipped to the United States, whose money is at a premium.

Mr. BAKER: I rise to a point of order. It is that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is not being given fair play by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. STEVENS: They do not worry me at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not notice any improper interjections, but the minister should be accorded perfect silence while he is speaking.

Mr. STEVENS: In the remarks I have just read the hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth says there is no advantage to the fishermen in this scheme. I want to ask him this question: Is it of no interest to those who last year exported \$1,500,000 worth of canned lobster to the United Kingdom that each pound sterling they receive should be worth \$4.60 to them instead of \$3.90 or \$4.10? I ask him if it is of no interest to those who exported \$3,500,000 worth of canned salmon to the United Kingdom that their pound should be worth \$4.60 instead of \$3.90 or \$4.10? Is it of no interest to the fishermen that these two items alone, totalling over \$5,000,000, should bring to Canada a larger return in terms of dollars and cents than would be possible under the existing rate of exchange? Is it of no advantage to the fishermen to obtain that increase? I have worked it out here and on these two items alone it would mean to the fishing industry an enhancement of their returns by over \$750,000.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member turned to the Minister of Finance; with a very solemn look on his face he leaned towards the minister and said: "If the minister wants to help the fishermen of the maritimes why does he not deny licences to trawlers?" That seemed to be a very solemn and a very im-